

The University of Chicago

SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS  
OF CHILDREN IN A WAR-BOOM  
COMMUNITY

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE  
SOCIAL SCIENCES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE  
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1946

By  
H. GERTHON MORGAN

Reprinted from

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH  
Vol. XL, No. 4, December, 1946



The University of Chicago

SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS  
OF CHILDREN IN A WAR-BOOM  
COMMUNITY

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE  
SOCIAL SCIENCES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE  
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1946

By

H. GERTHON MORGAN.

Reprinted from

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH  
Vol. XL, No. 4, December, 1946





# SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS OF CHILDREN IN A WAR-BOOM COMMUNITY

H. GERTHON MORGAN\*  
*The University of Chicago*

*Editor's Note:* The methods of cultural anthropology, sociometrics, and psychometrics are employed to describe factors influencing the social relationships of children and the process of change over a period in a newly formed community.

## INTRODUCTION

A CHILDREN's society which is an organized social world in itself is formed when children work and play together. The way in which any such group is internally organized depends on the kinds of relationships that exists between the children in it.

These relationships are the result of many different forces. Some are created by individual personality needs and ways of fulfilling these needs. Others emerge because of the developmental stage which the individuals in the group have achieved. Still others result from the pressures, expectations, and conditions of the larger social world in which the children's group is functioning.

In the classroom group every child gains a reputation and status of some kind or other, based partly on his actual behavior, and partly upon the picture people carry in their minds about the social group to which he belongs—pictures or "stereotypes" which they apply to him without waiting to find out whether he deserves it.

It is in this organized society of children that he learns how to make friends and how to get along with unfriendly people; he learns sportsmanship and the give and take of democratic social life among equals; he learns attitudes toward people of other colors, of foreign background, of other religions, and toward people who are born across the tracks.

Since the reputation and the status of a child affect his behavior, and determine to a considerable extent his chances for gaining some things he wants very much, it is important to study the factors that influence reputation and status.

---

\* Committee on Human Development, University of Chicago.

## PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to find out what are some of the factors, both in the larger social world and in the world of the school, that influence the social status and social reputation of children in a rapidly growing community. There was a unique advantage in studying this process in a rapidly growing community (in this case a war-boom community), because it was possible to study the whole process of many children becoming oriented into one social group, and because the process of making friends and gaining reputations was telescoped into a short time period.

At the start of the year the social structure of the school was fluid, and during the year it would crystallize. In such a situation the factors that produce social structure in a group of children—with some children high and others low in the scale of prestige, with cliques forming and relating themselves to other cliques—might be expected to stand out more clearly than they would in a stable community where children grow gradually into the social order of the school and neighborhood, and the forces operating are less perceptible.

Opportunity for such a study was created by World War II. During this time many people left their homes to settle in rapidly developing war industry centers. In these communities new social relationships were formed by adults and by children. New friendships were made and social reputations were ascribed to each member of the society.

This study examined the effect of the following factors on the social participation and social reputation of children:

1. Level of father's income.
2. Level of school achievement.
3. Length of residence in the community.
4. Place of residence in the community.

This study further explored the possible effect of the following additional factors on the social participation but not the reputation of children:

5. Section of the country from which the child came.
6. Religious affiliation.
7. Size of the community from which the child came.



## THE SUBJECTS OF THE STUDY

The war industry community selected for this study was Seneca, Illinois. This little community was listed in the 1940 Census as a village of 1,235 people. It was a typical, sleepy little farm market village. In May, 1942, Seneca was selected as a site for the construction of large ocean-going, tank-landing invasion ships. Peak employment reached 10,670 in February, 1945. Although the major portion of the workers lived in other towns, in December, 1943, at the time of the beginning of this study, Seneca's population had exceeded 6000 people. More than 2000 public housing units were added to the village's 300 homes. School enrollment increased from 300 to more than 1000 pupils.

The children included in this study were all children enrolled in grades five, six, seven, and eight of the Seneca Public Schools. There were two classroom groups at each grade level making a total of eight groups. Table I gives data on grade placement, number of subjects, and "newcomer-oldtimer" classification of the subjects.

TABLE I  
SUBJECTS OF THE STUDY

| Grade | "Oldtimer" | "Newcomer" | Total |
|-------|------------|------------|-------|
| 5     | 6          | 31         | 37    |
| 5     | 7          | 34         | 41    |
| 5     | 6          | 28         | 34    |
| 6     | 9          | 25         | 34    |
| 6     | 9          | 25         | 34    |
| 7     | 4          | 30         | 34    |
| 7     | 10         | 19         | 29    |
| 8     | 9          | 22         | 31    |
| 8     |            |            |       |
| Total | 60         | 214        | 274   |

Sixty of the subjects were old Seneca residents and 120 others came from other places in Illinois. The remaining 96 subjects include children from 25 different states.

## SECURING DATA

Written questionnaires were secured from children in classroom groups. Separate instruments were devised for the two areas of social relationships explored—participation and reputation. The participation data were obtained by the use of a sociometric test, a test based on the technique as developed

by Moreno, with friendship as the test criterion.<sup>1</sup> Social reputation was determined by the use of a Guess Who Test, an adaptation of the test used by Tryon in her study of Evaluation of Adolescent Personality by Adolescents.<sup>2</sup>

The social participation test asked children to write down the names of their very best friends in the classroom and to write down the names of those they considered unfriendly. The social reputation test was a small booklet of twenty-two pairs of social trait descriptions. Each description was followed by blank spaces in which the child wrote down the names of classmates who, in his opinion, fitted the description. To cite two examples: "Here is someone whom everybody likes. People are always glad to have him or her around." "Here is someone whom no one seems to care much about. People do not notice when he or she is around."

The tests were administered at two different time periods, the first in January, 1943, and the second five months later in May, 1943. The tests were given during school hours and the children were tested in their regular classrooms. Responses were limited to classmates and single classrooms were considered as basic social groups. The material in this study is a compilation of material gathered on the eight groups. Each child served in the capacity of both a subject and a judge. On each test the child was judging his classmates while they in turn were judging him.

In analyzing the social participation data every friendship choice and rejection was tabulated. The social reputation data were analyzed for the following social traits: active and not active in games, enthusiastic and not enthusiastic, good-looking and not good-looking, and likable and not likable. The other parts of the Guess Who Test were not used in this analysis.

Data on the seven factors selected for study as possible influences on social relationships were secured from several sources. Data on the section of the country from which the child came, the size of the community from which the child came, and the length of residence in the community were obtained from such sources as school records, written assignments entitled "Autobiography" and "My Home Town," and the 1940 Census. Occupational data were secured from the personnel files of the shipyard company

---

<sup>1</sup> J. L. Moreno, *Who shall Survive? A New Approach to the Problem of Human Interrelations*. (Washington: Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Company, 1934).

<sup>2</sup> Caroline McCann Tryon, *Evaluation of Adolescent Personality by Adolescents*, Monograph of the Society for Research in Child Development, IV No. 4, (1939).



and from interviews and observations for the occupational level of oldtimers in the community. The level of school achievement was measured by the Stanford Achievement Test, Form F, 1940. Data on religious affiliation were secured from church organization rolls and from interviews with local pastors and church leaders.

#### TREATMENT OF THE DATA

A separate analysis was made to determine the relationship of each of the seven factors to the social relationships of the children. The same general procedure was followed for the analysis of each of the factors. In analyzing the data on level of father's income, for example, the subjects were divided into three classifications according to the three income levels of the fathers—foreman, mechanic, and apprentice.

All workers in the shipyard were classified according to these three levels. Foremen were workers who had responsibility for a specific department (as foreman, sheet metal department), or for a general classification of workers (as foreman, welders; foreman, shorers; etc.). The foreman classification also included the shipyard executives and administrators. The mechanics were skilled craftsmen. They were experienced in a particular type of work and had the full occupational rating of a welder, fitter, burner, scaler, plater, electrician, etc. The apprentice was a general laborer who assisted a skilled worker or a group of skilled workers as a helper. The apprentice was known as a welder's helper, an apprentice scaler, an electrician's learner, etc.

This classification served for the shipyard workers only; the old residents in the town continued to follow their former occupations. However, it was possible to place many of the old residents at one of the three vocational levels when the salary and status of the old residents approximately equaled the salary and status of the shipyard workers. The local physician, for example, was rated at the foreman level, a grocer with a small business was placed at the mechanic level, and a trucker was included in the apprentice classification. Several judges checked the placement of oldtimers in the economic scale used. It was not possible to rank all oldtimers, such as farmers, and the data on the children of such workers were excluded from the analysis of this factor.

Each child in the foreman category served as a judge for children in all three categories and he in turn was judged by all children in the three

categories within his classroom group. Each child in the mechanic category judged all children in the three categories and he in turn was judged by all children in the three categories, and so on. The subjects' responses were tabulated so as to give the total number of votes obtained by each category of subjects from each category of judges for all classroom groups.

Since there were unequal numbers of subjects in the various income categories, certain equating procedures were necessary. It was necessary to equate both the opportunity for choosing (number choosing) and the opportunity for being chosen (number chosen). The number of mentions or "votes" obtained by a given category of subjects, divided by the number of subjects in the subject category, divided again by the number of judges in the judging category resulted in an index called the MSJ (mentions per subject per judge). The MSJ scores in this report were multiplied by 100 and they are read as mentions per 100 subjects per judge. The MSJ corrects for the variation in size of judge and subject categories, and yields directly measures that are comparable from category to category. The analyses presented in this report are given in MSJ scores.

#### FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

*Level of father's income factor.*—Studies by Warner and others have shown that people in American communities are members of a social status hierarchy.<sup>3</sup> A social class hierarchy has been found in all communities studied thus far. This means that people place themselves on a social scale—above some people, below others. They refer to the "the best people," "the big people," "the common man," "the chronic relievers," "the riff-raff," and so on. A careful examination reveals this system to be one of socially ranked groups, with varying degrees of social movement existing between them. Each of these groups is made up of people who associate or may associate freely with each other, but who do not associate freely with the groups "above" and "below" them.

An earlier study of social participation and social reputation of children in a stable mid-western community has shown that these social relationships are directly related to the social class placement of the families of the children

<sup>3</sup>a) W. Lloyd Warner and Paul S. Lunt, *The Social Life of a Modern Community*, Yankee City Series, (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press 1941).

b) W. Lloyd Warner, Robert J. Havighurst, and Martin B. Loeb, *Who Shall Be Educated?* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944).

studied.<sup>4</sup> This study concluded that the social class placement of the families affects the social participation and social reputation of the children of the families. For the purposes of this study of a war-boom population it was not possible to determine the social class placement of the children's families. Some of the factors used, nevertheless, are closely related to social status.

The level of father's income was studied because it is closely related to social status in a stable community. We can be assured that people with a high level of income would tend to achieve high social status as time went on. Accordingly, the father's income level was studied in relation to the friendship choices or refusals on the friendship test and the social trait ratings on the Guess Who Test.

All three groups of children tended to favor children of higher income families. The children whose parents were of the "Foreman" group were chosen more frequently as friends and were given higher reputation scores by the entire group of children. Even the children of the lowest or "Apprentice" group showed this "upward look" by choosing children above them in the scale more often than they chose members of their own group. At the same time the children of the low-income group were rejected more frequently, by themselves as well as by those above them on the economic scale. Table II summarizes in part these data. The table should be read across in this way:

The groups were equated in size so that in January the average child in the "Foreman" group chooses on an average of

2.84 children per 100 in the "Foreman" group,

2.00 children per 100 in the "Mechanic" group, and

1.78 children per 100 in the "Apprentice" group.

The differences between the MSJ ratings have been tested for their statistical reliability by the method of analysis of variance. There are highly reliable differences (at the 1% level) between the total votes given the different groups. The "Foreman" group is the most favored group, the "Mechanic" group is the second most favored group, and the "Apprentice" group is the least favored group. The differences between the row-column interaction scores are also highly reliable statistically (at the 1% level). Thus there is a significant tendency for all groups to place high choice scores with their own group members. The rejection ratings have also been tested for

---

<sup>4</sup> Bernice L. Neugarten, *Family Social Position and the Social Development of the Child*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1943.



statistical reliability by the method of analysis of variance. There tend to be reliable differences (at the 5% level) between the total of votes received by each group. This means that it is statistically reliable that the "Apprentice" group is the most unfavored group, the "Mechanic" group rates as a less unfavored group, and the "Foreman" group is the least unfavored group.

TABLE II

FRIENDSHIP CHOICES AND REJECTIONS AS RELATED TO LEVEL OF FATHER'S INCOME

| Participation Direction | Judging Group | Groups Judged |         |          |            |         |          |            |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------|----------|------------|---------|----------|------------|
|                         |               | Month         | January |          |            | May     |          |            |
|                         |               | Income Level  | Foreman | Mechanic | Apprentice | Foreman | Mechanic | Apprentice |
|                         |               | N             | 23      | 124      | 93         | 24      | 132      | 88         |
| Choices                 | Foreman       |               | 2.84    | 2.00     | 1.78       | 2.78    | 1.58     | 1.14       |
|                         | Mechanic      |               | 2.45    | 2.26     | 1.83       | 2.15    | 1.89     | 1.70       |
|                         | Apprentice    |               | 2.24    | 2.08     | 2.15       | 1.70    | 1.72     | 1.69       |
| Rejections              | Foreman       |               | .76     | 1.47     | .98        | .35     | .98      | 1.61       |
|                         | Mechanic      |               | .88     | .97      | 1.52       | .73     | 1.08     | 1.32       |
|                         | Apprentice    |               | .98     | 1.41     | 1.54       | .62     | .99      | 1.17       |

These same trends are true for social reputation as well as for friendship choices and rejections. The children higher on the economic scale were said to be better-looking, more active in games, more likable, and more enthusiastic. The children from lower income families ascribed the favorable traits to children of the groups above them, and the unfavorable traits more to the children of their own economic level. Table III summarizes this information.

The differences between the reputation MSJ ratings on item "Enthusiastic" for girls have been tested by the method of analysis of variance. There is a statistically significant (at the 5% level) tendency for members of all judging groups to mention the "Foreman" group most frequently and the "Apprentice" group least frequently. In addition, there is a strong tendency (statistically reliable at the 1% level) for each group to place a high choice score with their own group members. There are also highly reliable differences (at the 1% level) between the total choices (not shown in Table III) received by the different groups. These total scores also bear out the "upward look" pattern.

These trends in social relationships discovered after children had been together for a few months only follow the same trends found among children

TABLE III  
SOCIAL REPUTATION AS RELATED TO LEVEL OF FATHER'S INCOME

| Social<br>Trait     | Judging<br>Group | Groups Judged             |         |      |      |      |      |      |         |      |      |      |      |      |
|---------------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                     |                  | Sex                       | Boys    |      |      |      |      |      | Girls   |      |      |      |      |      |
|                     |                  |                           | January |      |      | May  |      |      | January |      |      | May  |      |      |
|                     |                  |                           | F       | M    | A    | F    | M    | A    | F       | M    | A    | F    | M    | A    |
|                     |                  | Month<br>Income<br>Levels |         |      |      |      |      |      |         |      |      |      |      |      |
|                     |                  | N                         | 9       | 60   | 42   | 11   | 66   | 43   | 11      | 65   | 45   | 10   | 64   | 42   |
| Good-Looking        | Foreman          |                           | 1.67    | 1.78 | .89  | 1.30 | 1.75 | .53  | 4.55    | 2.76 | 1.25 | 3.33 | 2.69 | .71  |
|                     | Mechanic         |                           | 2.33    | 1.40 | .54  | 1.52 | 1.36 | .75  | 2.77    | 2.17 | 1.61 | 2.53 | 2.57 | 1.42 |
|                     | Apprentice       |                           | 3.21    | 1.31 | .85  | 1.99 | 1.70 | .88  | 1.89    | 2.12 | 2.61 | 2.27 | 2.58 | 2.38 |
| Not Good-Looking    | Foreman          |                           | .56     | .44  | .64  | .00  | .21  | .64  | 2.27    | 1.24 | 2.51 | .95  | 1.00 | 2.24 |
|                     | Mechanic         |                           | .75     | .87  | .77  | .87  | .78  | 1.11 | .77     | 1.39 | 1.84 | 1.12 | 1.08 | 2.00 |
|                     | Apprentice       |                           | .60     | .97  | 1.51 | .44  | .73  | 1.40 | 1.44    | 1.35 | 1.81 | 1.02 | 1.63 | 2.44 |
| Active In Games     | Foreman          |                           | 5.56    | 2.58 | 2.17 | 5.63 | 3.36 | 2.25 | 6.36    | 3.27 | 2.30 | 5.71 | 3.46 | 1.88 |
|                     | Mechanic         |                           | 3.08    | 3.32 | 1.67 | 2.67 | 3.33 | 2.48 | 4.23    | 3.47 | 2.33 | 3.57 | 3.92 | 1.95 |
|                     | Apprentice       |                           | 3.69    | 2.70 | 3.20 | 2.55 | 3.15 | 2.76 | 4.89    | 3.38 | 2.91 | 2.83 | 3.74 | 3.17 |
| Not Active in Games | Foreman          |                           | 1.11    | 1.33 | 2.04 | 1.30 | 1.05 | 1.71 | 4.09    | 1.60 | .84  | 3.33 | 1.92 | 1.06 |
|                     | Mechanic         |                           | 2.00    | 1.35 | 1.03 | 2.31 | 1.43 | 1.55 | 1.46    | 1.85 | 1.66 | 1.64 | 2.03 | 2.11 |
|                     | Apprentice       |                           | 2.14    | 1.45 | 1.83 | 2.67 | 1.66 | 1.59 | 1.89    | 1.71 | 2.76 | 2.27 | 1.92 | 3.05 |
| Likeable            | Foreman          |                           | 3.89    | .98  | 1.92 | 3.46 | 1.61 | .32  | 3.64    | 1.96 | 1.57 | 2.86 | 2.54 | .82  |
|                     | Mechanic         |                           | 1.92    | 1.24 | .82  | 1.66 | 1.14 | .89  | 2.46    | 2.40 | 1.20 | 2.68 | 2.07 | 1.08 |
|                     | Apprentice       |                           | 2.14    | 1.10 | 1.23 | 1.88 | .93  | 1.01 | 1.33    | 1.76 | 1.81 | 1.70 | 1.98 | 2.18 |
| Not Likeable        | Foreman          |                           | 1.11    | .44  | 1.28 | .43  | .35  | 1.07 | .45     | .58  | 1.78 | .00  | 1.00 | 1.18 |
|                     | Mechanic         |                           | .33     | .48  | .46  | .14  | .45  | .89  | .46     | .90  | 1.20 | .45  | .78  | 1.53 |
|                     | Apprentice       |                           | .24     | .53  | .88  | .66  | .34  | 1.01 | .89     | .82  | 1.40 | .79  | 1.17 | 2.07 |
| Enthusiastic        | Foreman          |                           | 2.22    | 1.69 | .64  | 3.46 | 1.61 | .75  | 5.45    | 1.67 | .73  | 4.76 | 2.46 | 1.18 |
|                     | Mechanic         |                           | 1.92    | 1.91 | .87  | 1.59 | 1.70 | .78  | 2.85    | 2.89 | 1.72 | 2.38 | 2.67 | 1.45 |
|                     | Apprentice       |                           | 1.79    | 2.10 | 2.13 | 1.83 | 1.45 | 1.37 | 2.89    | 2.06 | 2.78 | 1.59 | 2.16 | 2.80 |
| Not Enthusiastic    | Foreman          |                           | .00     | .71  | 1.28 | .00  | .35  | .43  | .45     | .58  | .94  | .48  | 1.00 | .71  |
|                     | Mechanic         |                           | .67     | .64  | .59  | .65  | .68  | .89  | 1.23    | .90  | 1.27 | .45  | 1.03 | 1.47 |
|                     | Apprentice       |                           | 1.07    | .84  | 1.01 | .44  | .55  | .98  | .56     | .78  | 1.25 | .79  | .81  | 1.76 |

in a stable community. The trends discovered in the social relationships of children in the war-boom community are not so clear-cut as those found in the stable community probably because the war-boom community was not of long standing and social class lines were never clearly drawn. Furthermore, the residents of the war-boom community were of lower social status largely and social distance among them was not so great as is usual for the more stable community.

But it is clear from the comparison of the January and May data presented in this report that the trends and patterns in the social relationships of the war-boom community children moved toward crystallization in the period between January and May.<sup>5</sup> At the close of the study, choice discriminations were greater, differences in the total votes received by the different groups were larger, all trends were clearer, and there were fewer deviations from the general trends in May than in January. The May trends are similar to trends of long standing found in the more stable communities.

*Level of school achievement factor.*—The level of school achievement was studied because it was believed that children succeeding in the academic program of the school might be more at ease in establishing desirable social relationships with classmates. It was further believed that the academically successful child might have a better opportunity for not only gaining more favorable status but also for avoiding unfavorable status in the group. The child who is frustrated in the academic situation might very well become aggressive or apathetic in social situations. Furthermore, the school program itself fosters higher status for the academically successful child. In so far as the teachers from the first grade on influence the prestige and the social relationships of children, school achievement could well be a factor affecting the social relationships, since teachers are quite often unconsciously and involuntarily granting prestige to the child who shows high achievement. Teachers grades would be preferred to standardized achievement test scores in analyzing the influence of the teacher alone, but these were not available for any period of time for the majority of the children.

The analysis of the data on social relationships as related to levels of school achievement shows that the academically successful children are the more favored children in their own social group. Those children who scored

---

<sup>5</sup> There was a consistent tendency for the children to make fewer choices in May than in January. Hence, the MSJ scores are consistently lower.



high on the standardized achievement test tended to be favored by all the children's groups.

The subjects of each classroom group were divided according to scores on the achievement test. Those scoring in the top 25% in all classrooms were placed together in Group I. Group II includes all children who placed in the second highest 25% and so on down to Group IV which includes all children in the lowest scoring 25% of the subjects.

The children in Group I (highest achievement scoring group) received choices more frequently as friends and were ascribed more favorable reputation scores. This preference trend was expressed by Group I (highest), Group II (next to highest) and Group III. Group IV (lowest) favored the top achievement group, but it placed choices more frequently with Group II (next to highest). In general the second preference was given to Group II, the third was given to Group III, and Group IV was the least favored group. The children in all groups showed the "upward look" by choosing children above them in the academic scale more frequently than they chose members of their own groups.

The rejection pattern was consistent with this. Children in the lowest achievement scoring group were rejected more often, by themselves as well as by the children who placed above them on the achievement scale. Children in Group IV (lowest) received the highest rejection scores, those in Group III (next to the lowest) scored second highest in rejections, and so on. The choices and rejections are summarized in part in Table IV.

TABLE IV  
SOCIAL PARTICIPATION AS RELATED TO LEVEL OF SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT

| Participation Direction | Judging Group | Groups Judged         |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |
|-------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|
|                         |               | Month Achieve. Levels | January |     |     |     | May |     |     |    |
|                         |               |                       | I       | II  | III | IV  | I   | II  | III | IV |
|                         |               |                       | N       | 61  | 58  | 49  | 58  | 61  | 62  | 55 |
| Choices                 | I             | 2.8                   | 2.3     | 1.7 | 0.9 | 2.5 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.2 |    |
|                         | II            | 2.6                   | 2.3     | 2.0 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 1.2 |    |
|                         | III           | 2.3                   | 1.9     | 2.2 | 1.2 | 2.9 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 1.0 |    |
|                         | IV            | 2.3                   | 3.1     | 2.0 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 1.7 | 1.4 |    |
| Rejections              | I             | 0.6                   | 0.7     | 1.1 | 2.1 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 |    |
|                         | II            | 0.9                   | 0.8     | 1.2 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 1.8 |    |
|                         | III           | 1.0                   | 1.3     | 1.3 | 1.9 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 1.8 |    |
|                         | IV            | 0.9                   | 1.0     | 1.1 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.5 |    |

The differences between the choice ratings have been tested by the method of analysis of variance. There are highly reliable differences (at the 1% level) between the total votes given each group. This means that Group I (highest achievement scoring group) is the favored group, Group II (second highest achievement scoring group) is less favored, and so on down the academic scale. The differences between the rejection ratings were also tested by the method of analysis of variance. Here the choice pattern was reversed. There are highly reliable differences between the total votes given each group. This means that Group IV (lowest achievement scoring group) is the most unfavored group, Group III the next most unfavored group, and so on up the academic scale.

These trends were true for social reputation as well as for friendship choices. This means that the academically successful children were considered to be better looking, more active in games, more popular, and more enthusiastic. The children from the lower achievement levels ascribed the favorable traits to children higher in the achievement scale, and the unfavorable traits more to children of their own school achievement level. The data on social reputation are given in Table V.

For item "Enthusiastic" for girls, it is statistically reliable (at the 5% level) that all judging groups followed a similar pattern in placing choices. Each group favored Group I (highest achievement scoring group), favored less Group II, and so on down in order of achievement. The differences between the total votes received by the different groups were also highly statistically reliable (at the 1% level). This means that Group I is the most favored group according to total votes received, Group II is less favored, and so on. The row x column interaction is also highly significant statistically (at the 1% level). This there was a significant tendency for each group to place a high choice score with their own group members.

Level of school achievement was the one factor studied which showed no appreciable change in the period from January to May. The influence noted above for the January testing apparently had reached its maximum and did not increase during the next five months.

*The factors of length of residence in the community and place of residence in the community.*—Two contiguity factors, length of residence in the community and place of residence in the community, were also studied. Place of residence in the community is directly related to social class; length of

TABLE V  
SOCIAL REPUTATION AS RELATED TO LEVEL OF SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT

| Social Trait        | Judging Group | Sex | Groups Judged |      |      |      |      |      |         |      |      |      |      |      |
|---------------------|---------------|-----|---------------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                     |               |     | Boys          |      |      |      |      |      | Girls   |      |      |      |      |      |
|                     |               |     | January       |      |      | May  |      |      | January |      |      | May  |      |      |
|                     |               |     | I             | II   | III  | IV   | I    | II   | III     | IV   | I    | II   | III  | IV   |
| Good-Looking        | I             | N   | 21            | 29   | 16   | 28   | 27   | 35   | 25      | 36   | 35   | 26   | 27   | 23   |
|                     | II            |     | 2.64          | 1.13 | 1.00 | .19  | 1.79 | 1.31 | 1.30    | .24  | 3.37 | 1.77 | 2.10 | .97  |
|                     | III           |     | 2.22          | 1.94 | 1.60 | .81  | 2.76 | 1.66 | 1.36    | .61  | 2.75 | 1.96 | 2.42 | 1.36 |
|                     | IV            |     | 2.23          | 1.59 | 1.60 | .98  | 1.47 | .71  | 1.33    | .13  | 2.84 | 2.29 | 2.41 | 1.60 |
| Not Good-Looking    | I             | N   | 21            | 29   | 16   | 28   | 27   | 35   | 25      | 36   | 35   | 26   | 27   | 23   |
|                     | II            |     | 2.42          | 1.62 | 1.50 | 1.26 | 1.57 | .91  | .87     | .50  | 2.87 | 2.45 | 2.12 | 1.79 |
|                     | III           |     | .77           | .78  | .89  | 2.52 | .49  | .72  | .80     | 1.70 | 1.07 | 1.25 | 1.46 | 2.24 |
|                     | IV            |     | .62           | 1.07 | .72  | 1.96 | .38  | .74  | .80     | 1.12 | .62  | 1.54 | 1.88 | 2.04 |
| Active in Games     | I             | N   | 21            | 29   | 16   | 28   | 27   | 35   | 25      | 36   | 35   | 26   | 27   | 23   |
|                     | II            |     | .78           | 1.59 | 1.02 | 2.08 | .47  | .84  | 1.02    | .66  | 1.19 | 1.41 | 1.64 | 2.47 |
|                     | III           |     | .77           | .97  | 1.16 | 2.52 | .37  | .36  | .93     | 1.09 | 1.16 | 1.74 | 1.93 | 2.55 |
|                     | IV            |     | 4.42          | 4.16 | 3.54 | 3.73 | 3.77 | 2.21 | 2.54    | 1.76 | 3.93 | 3.53 | 2.86 | 1.99 |
| Not Active in Games | I             | N   | 21            | 29   | 16   | 28   | 27   | 35   | 25      | 36   | 35   | 26   | 27   | 23   |
|                     | II            |     | 3.69          | 4.45 | 2.81 | 3.25 | 2.62 | 4.16 | 2.62    | 1.87 | 3.98 | 4.69 | 2.85 | 2.19 |
|                     | III           |     | 3.46          | 3.64 | 6.54 | 3.80 | 2.53 | 2.71 | 3.76    | 1.25 | 3.44 | 3.50 | 3.96 | 2.69 |
|                     | IV            |     | 2.68          | 3.70 | 2.91 | 4.83 | 2.45 | 3.05 | 2.23    | 3.10 | 4.27 | 4.82 | 3.84 | 3.50 |
| Likeable            | I             | N   | 21            | 29   | 16   | 28   | 27   | 35   | 25      | 36   | 35   | 26   | 27   | 23   |
|                     | II            |     | 2.98          | 1.73 | 2.10 | 2.15 | 1.73 | .84  | .87     | .91  | 2.75 | 1.35 | 1.65 | 1.63 |
|                     | III           |     | 1.85          | 1.44 | 1.52 | 1.69 | 2.00 | 1.20 | 1.62    | 1.87 | 2.13 | 1.61 | 2.68 | 2.11 |
|                     | IV            |     | 2.57          | 1.93 | 1.31 | 3.55 | 1.93 | 1.55 | 1.18    | 1.44 | 1.98 | 1.01 | 2.07 | 1.96 |
| Not Likeable        | I             | N   | 21            | 29   | 16   | 28   | 27   | 35   | 25      | 36   | 35   | 26   | 27   | 23   |
|                     | II            |     | 2.74          | 1.82 | 2.24 | 1.61 | 1.81 | 1.16 | 1.25    | 1.32 | 2.25 | 1.26 | 3.44 | 2.81 |
|                     | III           |     | 1.79          | 1.73 | 1.22 | .37  | 1.54 | .96  | .58     | .06  | 3.27 | 1.71 | 1.46 | .61  |
|                     | IV            |     | 2.52          | 2.38 | 1.76 | 1.35 | 1.95 | 1.98 | .67     | .42  | 2.95 | 2.80 | 1.43 | .60  |
| Enthusiastic        | I             | N   | 21            | 29   | 16   | 28   | 27   | 35   | 25      | 36   | 35   | 26   | 27   | 23   |
|                     | II            |     | 1.70          | 1.70 | 1.60 | 1.11 | 1.40 | .84  | 1.49    | .33  | 2.58 | 2.02 | 3.62 | 1.53 |
|                     | III           |     | 2.10          | 1.36 | 1.00 | 1.26 | 1.25 | 1.08 | .49     | .77  | 3.11 | 2.29 | 1.72 | 1.36 |
|                     | IV            |     | .26           | .43  | .89  | 2.15 | .31  | .24  | .51     | 1.03 | .56  | .73  | .83  | 1.58 |
| Not Enthusiastic    | I             | N   | 21            | 29   | 16   | 28   | 27   | 35   | 25      | 36   | 35   | 26   | 27   | 23   |
|                     | II            |     | .49           | .56  | .58  | 1.83 | .10  | .60  | .78     | 1.50 | .43  | .35  | .81  | 1.36 |
|                     | III           |     | .56           | .91  | 1.02 | 1.85 | .00  | .39  | .47     | .59  | .79  | .94  | 1.55 | 2.32 |
|                     | IV            |     | .45           | .58  | .25  | 1.19 | .19  | .22  | .27     | .73  | .78  | .95  | 1.41 | 2.39 |
| Not Enthusiastic    | I             | N   | 21            | 29   | 16   | 28   | 27   | 35   | 25      | 36   | 35   | 26   | 27   | 23   |
|                     | II            |     | 3.92          | 2.16 | 2.33 | 1.49 | 2.22 | 1.19 | 1.60    | .79  | 4.08 | 2.03 | 1.71 | .87  |
|                     | III           |     | 2.77          | 2.76 | 1.36 | 1.56 | 1.62 | 1.13 | 1.92    | .94  | 2.61 | 2.94 | 1.97 | 1.06 |
|                     | IV            |     | 2.34          | 2.16 | 3.34 | 1.72 | 1.62 | 1.33 | 1.73    | .52  | 3.11 | 2.56 | 3.62 | 1.60 |
| Not Enthusiastic    | I             | N   | 21            | 29   | 16   | 28   | 27   | 35   | 25      | 36   | 35   | 26   | 27   | 23   |
|                     | II            |     | .68           | .87  | 1.11 | 1.49 | .86  | .60  | .44     | .97  | .77  | .94  | .95  | 1.53 |
|                     | III           |     | .70           | 1.13 | .48  | 1.56 | .57  | .65  | .56     | .94  | .89  | .63  | .98  | 1.73 |
|                     | IV            |     | .77           | 1.36 | 1.46 | 1.10 | .13  | .74  | .43     | .52  | 1.40 | .74  | .43  | 1.96 |



residence supplements social status positions. Contiguity should make for more favorable social relationships, and such factors tend to reduce the influence of other factors, such as the level of father's income.

The length of residence factor was considered as a study of relationships between "newcomers" and "oldtimers." In January "oldtimers" expressed a social preference for "oldtimers" while the "newcomers" expressed their preference indiscriminately. In the beginning all children were new to the "newcomers." After five months the "newcomers" changed in their preference and in the May testing they preferred "newcomers." At the close of the study the preference was given to their own group by both the "newcomers" and "oldtimers." These trends were true for social reputation as well as for friendship choices.

The data on place of residence in the community do not show that there was a single favored place in which to live in this war-boom community, but the data do show that there was an unfavorable place in which to live. This tendency increased during the school year. Children living in trailers, both in private trailers and in the federally owned Trailer Park, were rejected more frequently, by themselves as well as by other children in other areas of residence. This was more clearly evident in the last (May) testing. In a further analysis of children at the extremes of social participation ratings, two trailer children placed among the "most often chosen" children, eight were included in the "most often isolated" classification, and ten were rated as "most often rejected" children. This may be due to occupational status since the trailers housed low income families. On both social participation and social reputation children tended to give preferences to other children within their same neighborhoods, except for the trailer children.

*Other factors tested.*—The other variables tested did not prove to be particularly significant influences on social relationships. These variables include the section of the country from which the child came, the size of the community from which the child came, and religious affiliation. Religious affiliation is a status factor. The others are primarily factors in the experiential backgrounds of the children and were studied to find out if such experience patterns were significant influences in the formation of social relationships.

In the analysis of the data on section of the country from which the child came, all groups gave social preference to their own group members.

There was no pattern of status hierarchy among the different groups. Similarly, there was no status hierarchy among the different religious affiliation groups. In general these groups favored their own members.

As for the size of the community from which the children came, the Seneca children were preferred in social participation. In contrast to this, the rural children tended to be the most unfavored group. Children coming from the larger cities were favored over children coming from small villages and rural areas. The rural and small village children were chosen less frequently and were rejected more often as friends.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study investigated the relative importance of several factors that might affect the social reputation and social participation of children in a newly formed community. The study shows that some factors do influence these relationships; other factors are shown to be relatively unimportant.

The level of father's income is one factor that affects the social relationships of children. There is a positive relation between the level of father's income and the social relationships of children in this war-boom community studied. Children whose fathers' have higher occupational prestige tended to be preferred in social participation and were ascribed more favorable social reputations.

The analysis of the data on school achievement as related to children's social participation and social reputation indicate that this is an influencing factor. The data show that the academically successful children tend to be more favored children socially. Those children who scored high on the achievement test were favored by children in both social participation and social reputation. Children who scored low in achievement were rejected as friends more often and were unfavorably rated on social reputation. The influence of school achievement reached its maximum early (in the January testing) and did not increase to a significant extent during the time period of the study.

The two contiguity factors studied, length of residence in the community and place of residence in the community, are not so important in influencing social relationships as are factors of father's income and school achievement. The data do not indicate that there was a more favorable place of residence in this war-boom community that makes for good social relationships, but they do show that in this community there was an unfavored

place in which to live. Children living in trailers were not chosen so often as others for friends and they were given unfavorable social reputations. Low income families lived in the trailers, however, and this may account for the lack of social preference for children living in trailers. The factors of the section of the country from which the child came, the size of the community from which the child came, and religious affiliation are not important influences. Although these factors may be important at the adult level, the data from the study show that they are not very significant influences on the social relationships of children in a community of this type.

The two most important conclusions of this study are:

(1) When children in the fifth- to the eighth-grade levels are brought together in school in a newly formed community, the process of gaining social status and reputation in the group begins almost immediately and moves toward crystallization in a short time period.

(2) Specific factors that make for social status levels in the adult society also influence the social hierarchy that exists in children's groups. In this study, level of father's income and level of school achievement are the two most important factors.











